

THE  
CAMBRIDGE  
ANCIENT HISTORY

**3737**

EDITED BY

J. B. BURY, M.A., F.B.A.

S. A. COOK, LITT.D.

F. E. ADCOCK, M.A.

VOLUME II

THE EGYPTIAN AND HITTITE  
EMPIRES

TO C. 1000 B.C.

*CAMBRIDGE*  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
1931

	PAGE
IV. THE CONQUEST . . . . .	531
'The Return of the Heraclids' . . . . .	533
Corinth, Megara . . . . .	534
Aegina, Sparta . . . . .	535
Arcadia . . . . .	536
Arcadian and Dorian colonization . . . . .	537
V. SPARTA . . . . .	538
Capture of Amyclae . . . . .	539
Perioikoi and Helots . . . . .	540
Pylos, Messenia . . . . .	541

## CHAPTER XX

## HELLENIC SETTLEMENT IN ASIA MINOR

By D. G. HOGARTH

I. THE MAIN TRADITIONS . . . . .	542
Several stages of settlement . . . . .	543
Different social phases . . . . .	544
The Ionian Migration . . . . .	545
The dates . . . . .	546
Mallus and Troy . . . . .	547
II. THE RESISTANCE OF IONIA AND ITS CAUSE . . . . .	548
Early Anatolian monarchies . . . . .	549
Asiatic origin of Humanism . . . . .	550
Pre-Ionian civilization . . . . .	551
Early colonies . . . . .	552
III. THE EARLIER 'CARO-LELEGIAN' CIVILIZATION . . . . .	553
Archaeological evidence . . . . .	554
Leleges and Carians . . . . .	556
Phoenician influence . . . . .	557
IV. THE PROCESS OF SETTLEMENT . . . . .	558
Secondary colonization . . . . .	559
Milesian colonies . . . . .	560
Motive of colonization . . . . .	561

## CHAPTER XXI

## THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN

By PROFESSOR PEET, DR THOMAS ASHBY, D.LITT., F.S.A., and E. THURLOW  
LEEDS, M.A., F.S.A., Assistant Keeper of the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean  
Museum, Oxford<sup>1</sup>

I. ITALY AND SICILY . . . . .	563
Early traces of man . . . . .	563
Sergi's 'Mediterranean Race' . . . . .	564
Neolithic civilization . . . . .	565

<sup>1</sup> Professor Peet is mainly responsible for Sections I and V, Dr Ashby for Sections II and III, both for Section VI, and Mr Leeds for Section IV.

## CHAPTER XX

### HELLENIC SETTLEMENT IN ASIA MINOR

#### I. THE MAIN TRADITIONS

THE fact of Levantine history, which challenges most attention during the last quarter of the second millennium, is the settlement effected on the Anatolian islands and mainland coast by racial elements of the group to which the historic Hellenes belonged. While the fact of such settlement is certain, remarkably little is known about either the circumstances of the original colonization, or the early history of the colonists after establishment in their new homes. The historians, who, before the fifth century B.C., wrote about Greek Asia Minor, survive only in a few quotations; and valuable as is the history of Herodotus for the past of his own part of the world, still more valuable would have been the lost *Ionica* of his kinsman, Panyassis. Therefore, to an exceptional degree, we have to depend upon traditions preserved by Greeks of later times, and to make such synthesis as we can of their inconsistencies, contradictions and aetiological fabrications.

Archaeology gives as yet less help than it may be in a position to offer in the future. Very little scientific excavation has been carried out among primitive remains in western Asia Minor. The sites and immediate neighbourhoods of only two of the earlier Hellenic colonies have been searched deeply in any part; and, so far as their exploration has been reported, the oldest strata were examined over but a small area in each instance. These sites are those of Miletus and Ephesus. At the first-named place pre-Hellenic remains were tapped at one point within the city and at another outside its walls. At the second, the excavator dug down to the bottom of human remains in a small central space of the Artemisium site outside the town walls; but he found its lowest stratum by no means so old as might be expected to occur under the original city. Besides these remains, one pre-Hellenic tomb, denuded of more than half its contents in antiquity, at Assarlik in Caria, has been cleared by a scientific archaeologist. Other tombs in the same neighbourhood, which had been robbed completely, have been examined for their structural types and the fragments of pottery and other objects left in or near them.

It only remains to be said that a site of great antiquity has been explored deeply in the extreme north of the west coast—at Hissarlik in the Troad; but since no Hellenic colony seems to have been planted there till a late period, its evidence bears more on conditions preceding, or surrounding, the first advent of Greeks, than on the history of their actual settlement and early development. In the regions lying at the back of the Greek colonial belt, certain surface surveys and excavations have thrown light on the conditions under which the Greek settlements came into being and grew in early stages. Particular mention should be made of the excavations carried out on the sites of Sardes in Lydia, and Gordium in Phrygia. Explorations also in and about the 'Midas City' in Phrygia have provided a body of evidence of great value in this connection; and, as will be stated later, several instructive discoveries have been made elsewhere in the western interior of the peninsula.

It was a general belief of later Greeks that the primary settlement of the Anatolian islands and mainland coast by western colonists was very far from having been the work of a single mass migration. The foundation legends of the Asian colonies indicate a process protracted through many generations. The first stage seems to have been a long one of sporadic settlement and gradual infiltration by independent groups of settlers who left their western lands for very various reasons, without authoritative mandate or other community of purpose. This stage was regarded by tradition as having begun before the Trojan War, and closed some two or three generations after it. The second stage, according to the tradition, was one of more concentrated colonization, instituted after the return of the Achaeans from Troy, lasting a comparatively short time, and completed by, say, the close of the eleventh century B.C. It usually is known to historians as the Ionian Migration, and was believed by the Greeks themselves to have been caused by the overcrowding of Attica with returned warriors and refugees from Troy. They credited this movement with a common impulse, and ascribed its guidance to sons of king Codrus.

At the same time it must be borne in mind that neither Greek tradition nor Greek history warrants the assumption that these groups of migrants were sent forth by Athens to be extensions of herself. They were simply men turned loose to find homes elsewhere. None of the resultant settlements in Asia seems to have retained an intimate tie with Athens as its mother-city; all developed apart from her, and on different lines. Miletus, for

example, though she kept the four Attic tribes, named half her months differently and paid no special honour to the Athenian goddess. Apollo became her tutelary deity. Samos adopted a non-Ionian goddess, Hera, as chief patroness; and, more even than Miletus, diverged from Athens in the nomenclature of her calendar and her tribes. The greater Greek settlements of Asia, in short, must not be thought of as colonies of western cities in anything like the same sense as the secondary Greek settlements in Asia Minor. These last were true colonies of the first settlements there: so, for example, Iasos was a colony of Miletus, and Nagidos, in Cilicia, of Samos. But, while these secondary settlements were founded for the benefit of the metropolis, no such idea seems to have actuated the earliest colonization of Asia Minor by Greeks, or to have survived in the subsequent relations of the colonies to the mother-cities. This is as true of the Dorian and Aeolian colonies, as of the Ionian.

The earlier traditional period includes two social phases. The first is one of foundation or seizure of settlements by sons of gods, by heroes, by Amazons, and by various peoples whom we regard as pre-Hellenic, such as Telchines or other Cretans, Leleges, Carians, Minyans and Pelasgians, the last being stated to have come from European mainland districts, ranging from Laconia to Thessaly. The second phase—how far overlapping the first, we do not know—is proto-Hellenic, the colonization being then the work of Dorian or 'Aeolic' Greeks. The Dorians are derived, in the legends, chiefly from Argos and cities of the Argolid: the Aeolic settlers, from Thessaly, Phocis, and other parts of northern and central Greece, including the Megarid; but whether from the last before or after its conquest by Dorians is not clear. The Dorian settlers make for the southern Sporades and the south-western coast of the Anatolian mainland—the region known in classical times as Caria—and for other regions lying as far round the south coast of the peninsula as Cilicia. The northern Greeks make for the north-western shores from Magnesia and Cyme round to the Propontis, into which the voyage of the 'Argo' from Thessalian Iolcus had shown a way. Each of these great groups, it will be observed, colonized its opposite coast; and between the two areas so settled there remained a considerable interval uncolonized by either and reserved for the subsequent Ionian Migration. This tract is the long and deeply indented littoral which extends from south of Mount Mycale to north of the Hermus estuary, together with the great islands of Samos and Chios. It may be said at once that the legendary ascription of the

two original groups of settlements to southern and northern Greeks respectively is argued to be fact by such evidence as the classical speech and communal organization of the Greek colonies in north-western and south-western Anatolia afford. The dialects spoken by the Greeks from Miletus right round to Mallus in Cilicia, and also in Cyprus, are nearest kin to Peloponnesian dialects of later times; and tribe-names appear in Carian and Pamphylian colonies which are known elsewhere only in the Peloponnesus. For the Aeolic north we have no such good evidence from tribe-names; but its prevailing dialect was related nearly to that of classical Thessaly.

A third social phase coincides with the second stage of settlement—the Ionian Migration. This movement again follows its own parallel first, apparently, to the islands from Lesbos to Chios and Samos, and finally to that mainland tract which had been left free by the two earlier groups of migrants. To substantiate the claim of the Ionian cities to belong to the same social group as the Athenians positive evidence is offered by their dialect and social organization in later times. For example, Miletus had all the four Attic tribes, to which it added two non-Attic. We may conclude, however, from the failure of two of the greatest Ionian cities, Ephesus and Colophon, to celebrate the *Apatūria* (the Athenian festival of the *Phratry*) that there was mixture in the Ionian Migration, as, indeed, Greek tradition always held there was. We hear both that the Greek settlers themselves were heterogeneous and also that they amalgamated with the indigenous population. Among original non-Ionian elements Thessalians and Boeotians can be discerned, both being in considerable strength, and possibly earlier established in Ionia than the elements from Attica. They seem to be represented by the two non-Attic tribes of Miletus.

For lack of archaeological material, this tradition of the stages and social phases of the original Greek colonization of Asia Minor cannot further be controlled. Some allowance, doubtless, must be made for popular antedating of later ideas and conditions. Thus, the ethnic distinction of 'Dorians' from 'Ionians,' as well as the ethnical character in later times of certain colonies, whose respective mother-cities had become subsequently seats of either Dorians or Ionians (Megara is an example of change after the colonizing age), may have been presumed by the tradition at too early dates. Later, at all events, we know that the Ionian name, in the form *Yāwān*, represented to the Semitic peoples of Asia all Greeks without distinction. This use may have come about (as usually is assumed) through the greater familiarity of the East

then and previously with seafaring men from the Ionian cities, especially Miletus, than with those from less opulent and less venturesome non-Ionian communities.

While the balance of probability is in favour of such an explanation of a use which had evidently become habitual with Assyrians and Hebrews by the times of Sargon and Ezekiel (xxvii, 13), the possibility must not be lost sight of altogether that the use may have been so much older than those times that it implies the existence of an 'Ionian' people somewhere in Asia Minor before the historical Ionian Migration. If the Hebrew race-genealogy, contained in Genesis x, which includes Javan (Yāwān), as 'father' of (probably) Citium (Cyprus), Tarsus (Cilicia), Elishah (the Aleian Plain?) and Rhodes, were to be accepted for a faithful embodiment of very ancient Semitic geography and ethnology, that possibility would become almost a certainty; but, in fact, it is far from proved that the genealogy in question is much older, as we have it, than the age in which it was apparently written down, that is, perhaps the later period of the Hebrew monarchy (see vol. 1, p. 184 *sq.*). Two names which also appear in it, Meshech and Tubal, certainly represent peoples who were unimportant, if existent at all, in Asia Minor till near the end of the second millennium B.C.; and if its warrant for Yāwān goes no farther back than this date, it does not necessarily imply pre-Migration Ionians.

At the same time there are reasons for pushing the first appearances of Greek settlers in the easternmost Levant back to very early days, earlier, perhaps, than their settlement on any point of the west coast of Asia Minor. As has been remarked often, the origin of the 'Arcadian' colonies in Cyprus seems lost in an antiquity more remote than that of any other Greek settlements in Asia. The peculiar syllabic script used by the Cypriotes of historic times is so ill-adapted to the expression of the Greek language that its choice for that purpose cannot reasonably be explained except by presuming its use firmly established in the island before the convenient Graeco-Phoenician alphabetic characters were invented (vol. 1, p. 144). That is to say, we must assume a firmly-established Greek population in Cyprus well before, at latest, the tenth century B.C. Also the use, in the earliest Cypriote inscriptions known, of a Greek name—the word for 'queen'—to designate the tutelary goddess of the island, points to early local prevalence of the Greek race and of Greek speech.

Moreover, on the opposite Cilician coast, Mallus (which perhaps is the Mannus mentioned in Egyptian texts of the XVIIIth

Dynasty, in conjunction with Asy and Alashiya, as a centre even then of power and importance) had, as a Greek colony, an accepted foundation legend which differentiates it from other Greek settlements in Asia Minor and may imply general belief in its superior antiquity. The joint founders of Mallus, according to the legend, were actual members of the force that besieged Troy. After its fall they do not go to Greece, but travel south to the shrine of the Clarian Apollo in pre-Ionian Ionia, and thence wander eastwards to found cities in the bay of the Levant. One of the pair, whose name appears in an old designation of Pamphylia, and at two Cilician spots, Mopsuestia on the Pyramus, and Mopsucrene on the road northwards from Tarsus, may be the same Mopsus (or Moxus) who, according to a Greek legend about early Lydia, pushed into Syria and, reaching Askalon, threw its tutelary goddess into her own sacred lake—a story which sounds curiously like an echo of the historic invasion of Palestine early in the twelfth century B.C. by peoples of Asia Minor. Cilician Tarsus also was credited with early Greek colonists. In the seventh century, as we know from a record of Sennacherib, a Javanian people was resident in Cilicia, apparently not on the coast only. How long had it been there? and how did Cilicia come to be before the end of the second millennium (as from certain classes of objects found in north Syria and Cyprus as well as in Cilicia itself, it may reasonably be claimed to have been, even if it were not, the seat of the Keftians) a centre of art strongly influenced by Aegean forms and decoration? The answer must be sought in the unexplored soil of the region itself.

The Greeks habitually looked to the Trojan War as an era by which to date the foundation of their colonies in Asia Minor. For this habit they had cause; since, probably, that war was itself an early episode in the story of their settlement. Desirous to effect a footing on the calm shores of the Hellespont and the Propontis, a Greek confederacy under Achaean leadership found itself confronted by an Anatolian confederacy, which drew allies from coast-lands as remote as Lycia, and had Phrygian support at its back. If the period now generally proposed for that struggle, the middle of the twelfth century, be approximately correct, it coincides significantly with the later phases of those large movements of peoples into and out of Asia Minor, which destroyed the Hattic kingdom in Cappadocia, and were brought to a stand at last, perhaps on the frontier of Egypt, by the resistance of Ramses III<sup>1</sup>. In the general catastrophe of elder powers of Asia

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 174 sq., 283 sq., 321.



Minor under pressure from the north, whether from the Caucasian or the Thracian country or from both, men of the west seized an opportunity.

## II. THE RESISTANCE OF IONIA AND ITS CAUSE

If an approximate date—about 1150 B.C.—may be accepted for the beginning of Greek settlement on the western Anatolian shore, there is no good reason for rejecting the chronology which the Greeks accepted for the subsequent process. They believed the central section of the littoral to have been the last upon which their colonists had landed to stay. Obviously their belief needs explanation, seeing that this central section is at once the most fertile and clement, the best provided with sheltered harbours, and the most favoured by natural routes of communication with the interior. Admirably adapted by nature to the development of Hellenic society, as history would prove, why did not Ionia attract Greek settlers before the comparatively arduous, lean and isolated south-west, and the comparatively cold and harbourless north-west? The explanation may lie, not in accident—for one cannot suppose so near and accessible a coast as the Ionian—to have been less known to Aegean peoples than the rest of western Anatolia—but in the existence of a hostile society there sufficiently organized and compact to keep rovers of the seas away.

Such an assumption finds support from two facts. First, that in the heart of this section—in the Smyrna-Magnesia district—are to be seen the most notable pre-Hellenic remains yet observed in western Anatolia, namely, the Hittite rock-sculptures and the sanctuaries at different points of the Sipylus range—the so-called Tantalid tombs and the fortifications at the head of the Gulf of Smyrna. Second, that in or near this section lay the four (or, perhaps six) cities whose foundation was ascribed by Greeks to Amazons. In view of all the facts, there can be little doubt that an organized Asiatic state which derived ultimate inspiration from the Hattic empire at its greatest period, *i.e.* the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C., was established on the Aegean coast at the point at which debouch the two great arteries leading from the central plateau by way of the valleys of the Hermus and the Maeander. This coastal kingdom, which was centred at 'Aeolic' Smyrna, probably supported itself in independence first of the Cappadocian king and subsequently of the Phrygian, who can hardly have maintained at so great a distance provincial administrations.

In any case, it seems that in the central section of the west coast,

during the latter part of the second millennium, the strength of inland societies of Asia Minor was felt sufficiently to retard Greek settlement for some generations after it had been effected to south and north. Those natural inland ways, which would make the later fortunes of the Ionian cities, not only served for a long time to keep Hellenes out of the best heritage in western Asia Minor (as, to judge by the paucity of Aegean remains of the full Minoan periods, they had long kept Cretans), but they were to continue to spell danger to Hellenism after it had made good its footing. Smyrna, Ephesus and Miletus remained throughout classical times the Greek cities most generally contaminated with Orientalism: and, probably, Colophon, not a pure Ionian city, should be added to the trio. Smyrna was vexed continually by migrations and attacks from inland, was destroyed by the Lydians, and remained unable to establish itself firmly as a Greek city till quite late days. Ephesus, whose cult retained a strong Asiatic flavour to the last, lay equally at the mercy of attacks from inland, whether Cimmerian or Lydian. Miletus, threatened with even greater frequency, but well defended, either by marshes or by a stout Carian element in its population, appears in the history of Greek art as the chief propagator of oriental motives, and in the history of Hellenic politics as often detaching itself from the comity of Hellenism despite the boasted purity of its Ionian blood.

Once the Greek elements had established themselves on the Anatolian coast, their societies developed what the world has since deemed typical Hellenism more rapidly than the communities which claimed to be their mothers. All seem to have begun independent life (after intervals of various duration according to the strength of the native community into which each group of settlers intruded) with some form of monarchy: the kings, in the Ionian colonies, being either Codridae of Athenian extraction, or Glaucidae of Lycian origin. The latter perhaps obtained power where the Ionian element was weakest. In Cyme kingship lasted on to the close of the eighth century B.C. at least; but elsewhere it had vanished before that date. Under the monarchs the Hellenic elements as a whole constituted aristocracies distinguished from more numerous native non-Greek populations; and their distinction, as can be divined in the history of Miletus, in the sixth century, long survived the fall of the monarchies, unobliterated by any complete Hellenization of the native elements.

The Greek aristocracies, however, as by natural increase and by fresh accessions of western Hellenes they tended quickly to become majorities of the town-dwellers, developed within them-

selves new distinctions, small groups gaining and holding power and privilege, against the rest; and the first historical light which falls on Ionian cities reveals the Hellenic class in each already divided into land-owning oligarchs, and potential democracies, unprivileged and unquiet, which, though far as yet from realizing the ideal of the rule of all by all in turn, had often achieved the first step towards that end by substituting a single elective chief for the rule of a self-appointed few. Thus Miletus, which was administered by an elective President of the Council in the seventh century, had even earlier been under an elective dictator; while Ephesus, if Greek tradition is to be believed, seems to have arrived at something like republican equality among its Hellenic aristocrats within two or three generations of its first settlement by Ionians. At Colophon, also, there is evidence for very early struggles within the Hellenic class between a majority and a land-owning minority, the ultimate victory resting with the last, after the more intractable elements had been expelled to seek refuge at Smyrna and at Ephesus. The 'Tyrannis,' which does not appear in Asia till near the close of the seventh century, was, in its origin, a product of increasing democracy; and the set-back which, by its development, it administered to that movement was more apparent than real, an eddy in a stream rather than a reversal of its general direction. Nor was it only in political evolution that these cities took a start of their European mother. Other fruits of free, leisured and luxurious life reached maturity earlier in them. The intellectual and artistic output of the Asiatic Hellenes in the eighth and seventh centuries has so little contemporary counterpart in European Greece, that typical European Humanism may justly be said to have originally been developed in cities of Asia<sup>1</sup>.

To account for this phenomenon of rapid development—a graft which overtopped its parent tree within so short time—the continental position of the Asian cities as compared with the peninsular or insular positions of the European Greek states may be pleaded. The former societies had behind them a larger area from which to draw wealth and civilization. It is only necessary to pass at the present day from Piraeus to Smyrna to be conscious of entering a world of greater possibilities. To appreciate the validity of this cause it will be necessary to study, in a later volume, what is known of the societies which lay at the back of the Greek colonies during the periods of both their first establishment and subsequent early development. Other causes no doubt

<sup>1</sup> With the following paragraph, cf. the independent argument, p. 400 *sq.*

contributed: for instance, the natural fertility of western Anatolia, which is greater in both degree and extent than that of western Greece, and its less rigorous climate and easier access to eastern seats of civilization. But the sum of these causes taken together has appeared to historians insufficient to explain the whole result, unless, in addition, some comparatively high culture can be supposed to have already been established when and where the Greek settlements came to be planted. For this reason the hypothesis of the pre-existence in western Anatolia of a proto-Ionian race, Hellenic but not European, has been put forward. If anything like the usual signification is to be attached to the term Hellenic, the hypothesis is untenable. But it served, and serves still, to call attention to the probable fact that some civilization, which, though 'barbarian,' as Greeks used this word, rose far above barbarism, was possessed and practised by a race or races already domiciled on the west Anatolian coast at the moment that the first Hellenic settlers arrived.

It would have been unnecessary to call attention to the contradiction offered by the foundation-legends of the primary Asiatic colonies to any contention that they were founded *in vacuo*, were it not for the insistence of modern historians on esoteric geographical knowledge shown by the western oracles in directing Hellenic colonists, and on the admirable topographical choices made by the colonists themselves. This insistence leaves students with the impression that, in most instances, the colonies were planted on coasts previously unknown to Greeks, and devoid of urban settlements. On the contrary, Greek belief held that in Asia Minor, at any rate, bands of Hellenes were introduced at very various times and by very various processes into pre-existent towns. In its view the credit for the selection of their sites rested, therefore, with the pre-Hellenic peoples. In fact, credit is not due to anyone in particular. The towns which the Greeks found were the fittest which had survived an evolutionary process centuries old. Village settlements had grown into towns, or remained villages, or dwindled away, under the selective influence of local natural conditions—here, a sheltered inlet compared to, there, an open strand swept by surf or currents; here, good and abundant water, there, scanty and bad; at the back of one locality easy gradients and healthy tracks to the interior, contrasted with the confused hills, forests, marshes or malarious and fly-haunted valleys behind another.

To whomsoever it assigned the credit, the fact remains that Greek tradition gave to Hellenes the first settlement of hardly

any spot on the west Asiatic coast which eventually was occupied by a Greek colony; still more rarely did it ascribe first settlement to any 'Hellenes' whose Hellenism can stand examination by our present knowledge of the pre-Hellenes. A summary synthesis of the foundation-legends of the principal west Asiatic colonies shows that those held responsible for their original settlement were as follows: Pre-Hellenic Cretans ('Telchines' who lived in the time of the gods and were connected with the foreign deity, Poseidon) for Rhodes (in part), Erythrae, Chios (part) and Magnesia ad Sipylum (part); Pelasgians for Cnidus (its founder was a son of Poseidon), Chios (part), Clazomenae, Lesbos (part), and Cyzicus; Amazons (*i.e.* some Asiatic power) for Ephesus, Smyrna, Cyme, Myrina and, perhaps, Colophon; Carians or Leleges (or both) for Rhodes (part), Halicarnassus, Mylasa, Miletus, Priene, Samos, Lebedos, and Chios (part); Lydians for Adramyttium, and some pre-Hellenic element of the Troad for Lampsacus and Abydos, princes of which towns were joined with Priam against the Achaeans. Another pre-Hellenic element, the Heliadae or 'Sons of the Sun,' preceded the Hellenes in Rhodes, Cos and Lesbos. Teos, whose inscriptions display, as it happens, a remarkable proportion of non-Greek names, began as a Minyan city; and 'Cadmeians' were held partly responsible for early Rhodes, where Lindus, Camirus, and Ialysus were already cities before the Trojan War or the coming of any Dorian Argives. The three great oracular sanctuaries of Greek Asia, at Patara, Branchidae, and Notium (Clarium)—all, be it noted, sacred to Apollo, a deity usually supposed to have been of Asiatic origin—were in existence before the advent of Hellenes. The last-named advised the Homeric hero, Mopsus; and Branchidae seems to have been a sanctuary of an Asiatic sky god (Zeus Branchus) before it was one of Apollo.

This summary leaves no primary colonies of the first class, except, perhaps, Phocaea, to be claimed for Hellenic founders in virtue of beliefs held by Greeks themselves. It has often been remarked that the *Iliad* betrays no knowledge of a Greek element on the mainland of Asia, and cites Miletus as a city of the barbarous-speaking Carians. The early Ionian author, Pherecydes, is quoted by Strabo as evidence that the Ionian colonists, on arrival, found all the central section of the west coast held, as to the northern part, by Leleges, and as to the southern, by Carians. With these, we are told that the colonists mixed their blood so thoroughly that Ionians of the west, *e.g.* the Athenians, never regarded them as pure kin. In one instance we hear of Greek

settlers building a new fort near an old city. Phocians from Thermopylae founded Neonteichos, near Cyme; but when they got possession of the latter, they deserted their earlier foundation. It is an exception which, by bearing implicit testimony to the pre-Hellenic existence of Cyme, proves our rule.

### III. THE EARLIER 'CARO-LELEGIAN' CIVILIZATION

What civilization (or civilizations), then, can have been occupying the west Anatolian coast when the first Hellenic settlers arrived? by what race or races developed and enjoyed? and how far, on our present knowledge, to be esteemed capable of exercising sufficient educative influence on those settlers to help to account for their subsequent aptitude for humanism? On the evidence of tradition, the racial term Caro-Lelegian may be attributed to such a civilization more generally and fitly than any other; for it is not only in the southern section of the coast, from Caunus round to Lebedos and on Samos and Chios, but also in the central section, according to Pherecydes, and in the Troad, according to Aristotle, that we hear of Caro-Lelegians at an early period. So far, then, as any one racial element can be said to have held the west Asiatic coast during a period immediately preceding that of Greek colonization, it is this.

According to the tradition, also, this pre-Hellenic society was contaminated by two considerable alien bodies, one composed of elements from beyond the western sea, in which Cretans and Pelasgians figure prominently; the other of elements from the interior, implied in the Phrygian relations of both the Troad and the Smyrna district and in the Amazonian legends attached to cities of the central coast. From such a racial stock, affected by such contributory influences, a civilization mixed of western and eastern elements in equal parts is to be expected. The western element in this should be predominant, and be Aegeo-Cretan of the Late Minoan kind; the eastern, of inferior strength, should be compounded of Phrygo-Cappadocian ingredients derived overland, and of Egypto-Syrian ingredients derived oversea, some Mesopotamian inspiration being infused into both ingredients.

As has been implied already, our archaeological knowledge of the remains of the earliest periods of culture on the west Anatolian littoral is very far from sufficient to test thoroughly the truth of such a hypothesis as is stated here. But so far as that knowledge goes, it supports our hypothesis, inasmuch as objects of Late Minoan fabric and derivation have turned up from time to time

at points all along the coast-line from Caria up to the Troad. Indeed they have been found whenever and wherever strata or tombs of any age near to that of the first Greek settlement have been explored. In Caria, Telmissus has produced one fortuitous piece of evidence, a 'stirrup-vase' of late type now in the British Museum. But on the Myndus peninsula at Assarlik, probably the site of the Lelegian Termera, there was found, in the excavation of a chambered tumulus which had been half-robbed, ample proof that its grave-furniture had represented a civilization of the latest Minoan-Mycenaean kind; while subsequent explorations established the fact that, at least on this peninsula, a culture of early Cycladic type was succeeded by one strongly influenced by the later Aegeo-Cretan culture. A fine vase of this latter period, from Mylasa, is in the Evangelical School at Smyrna; while, from Stratonicea in the interior and from Changli, near the site of the Panionium on Mount Mycale, have come other vases of the later Cycladic types, of which Phylakopi in Melos yielded an abundant harvest. In the interspace, at Miletus, sherds of the latest Minoan-Mycenaean style were found predominating in the earth under the Athena temple, the only spot within the city which has been explored deeply. Farther to the north, Myrina has yielded the same pottery; and the 'Mycenaean' character of the vases and other remains of the 'Sixth City' at Hissarlik is very well known. The geographical gaps between these divers points have not yet been explored for strata and tombs of the age in question—not even the gap which includes almost all Ionia, although considerable search has been made in its soil for later remains. The earliest stratum there explored was on the site of the Ephesian Artemisium; but at the bottom of all human remains there, the excavator had not penetrated behind the eighth century B.C.

Before, and probably long before, the introduction of this comparatively late influence of the Aegean, the existence, in western Anatolia, of a widely-spread native civilization which was related to that of the Cyclades, is established by sporadic but sufficient evidence. It has been mentioned already that remains of it were found in Caria, the chief item of evidence being the type of tomb which precedes that associated with objects of Late Minoan style. Unmistakable vases of this earlier culture, which have come from points as far inland as Dinair (Celaenae-Apamea) in Phrygia and as Isbarta in Pisidia, and as far round the south coast as western Pamphylia, have been collected into the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. They are chiefly beaked jugs

of burnished brown ware, decorated with incised vandykes and zigzags, and remarkably similar, in form, in treatment of surface and in ornament, to the contents of the early Melian cemetery at Pelos. With such pottery were found marble idols both of Cycladic types and also of a distinct type well known on the Thracian coast of the Aegean and in the Danube region.

Of slightly later period are vessels of similar shapes (also to be seen in the Ashmolean) decorated in white pigment with the same general schemes of ornament as the incised vases. These show that the culture lasted a considerable time and went through the ordinary process of ceramic development. The early village site at Kiliktepé, near Miletus, is also of this culture, to judge by the preliminary report of its excavation. Its inhabitants used hand-made pottery burnished and decorated with incised zigzags, and also obsidian knives, which must have been imported from Melos. These stone implements, it should be observed, do not necessarily imply a neolithic date: their use was maintained far into the age of bronze over all the Aegean area. Vases found at Yortan in Mysia and Bighadich in the Troad (now in the Louvre, the British Museum and the Ashmolean) repeat the Isbarta forms, but with surface treatment more like that of early Bosnian vases at Butmir; and the resemblance to Danubian fabrics is as strong in the pre-Mycenaean wares of Hissarlik as we should expect in close proximity to the Hellespont. At the same time, these Trojan wares, like all the rest cited above, belong essentially to the Aegean cycle of production. Scanty and scattered as are these items of evidence, they are enough to impose the conclusion that, for a long age previous to the introduction of Minoan-Mycenaean influence, west Asia Minor had preserved a culture so near akin to the Cycladic as to imply the inhabitation of both isles and Asiatic coast by populations generally of one stock and a common history.

If we turn back to the Greek literary tradition and combine this with what is known of historical Leleges and Carians, who survived into the classical period—both still were recognized peoples in the fourth century B.C. and even later—we find much that argues not only a wide range for them in early times, but also ample opportunity for the reception of Cretan and other Helladic cultural influences by a civilization of the west Anatolian coast. Since the Greeks themselves disputed whether Leleges and Carians were two sections of one people or distinct peoples (p. 8), it would be futile now to try to decide the question. In any case they are most intimately linked in the tradition which records



their simultaneous presence on the Greek mainland, in the Aegean islands and on the Asiatic mainland. They coexisted even in Caria itself, where Philip of Theangela, speaking with local knowledge, says the Leleges had in his time a servile status. Herodotus, Thucydides and Strabo alike put them into a relation with Minoan Crete. Though they were not themselves peoples of that island (actual Minoan Cretans, so far as they are known to have migrated permanently, took a western, not an eastern direction), they were subjects or enemies of its king. Minos drove the Carians out of the islands, says Thucydides; or he made galley-slaves of them, as Herodotus states. They are credited with having ruled the sea at one epoch, and Cretans remembered them, according to Herodotus, among the more famous peoples of the olden time. That, in fact, they did once hold the Cyclades is attested by Thucydides' story about the Carian graves opened on Delos in his own time: but the belief of Carians themselves was that their main seat had always been on the south-west Anatolian littoral; and their Asianic speech supports their story.

If any estimate of the quality of Caro-Lelegian culture is to be formed, certain facts must be noted. The Carians had been in contact, more or less intimate, with Minoan Cretans; they were bold sea-rovers of whom we hear in early traditions of *toxyns* on the Black Sea, such as Tanais (their speech is probably to be detected in such names as Odessus, Hermonassa and Salmydessus); and they were a literate people, for they had a peculiar Asianic script of their own, epigraphic specimens of which survive. Further, Thucydides believed that their armament was better than that of the Hellenic settlers, since these adopted their helmets and shields with the plumes and the grips. His view of their military competence is supported by the well-known fact that at least as early as the seventh century B.C. Carians were much in request as soldiers of fortune. The *Iliad* is an early authority for their practice of fine handicrafts in metal, ivory and leather. Later authors add the cutting of precious stones and purple-dyeing, and credit them with a metric system, with improvements in ship-building, with refinements of music and the invention of certain musical modes, with an apparatus for writing, and with some improved form of mill for grinding corn. These, or some of these, achievements may stand to the credit of later Carian generations than are yet in question; but most of them smack of early Aegean days. It is, in any case, clear that Greek literary tradition regarded the early Caro-Lelegians as possessed of a relatively high culture; and the positive evidence of archaeology

all tends to relate their civilization to that of Late Minoan Crete, and of Mycenaean Greece. Almost everything has yet to be learned about the social organization of the 'Late Minoan' world. It need not be inferred from the poorer quality of its art products, that its civilization, as a whole, was inferior to that of the full Minoan age. History demonstrates in all ages that the organization of societies, political, economic and domestic, is not only maintained but improved after the decline of periods of great art, which mark aristocratic semi-feudal stages of racial development. The subsequent and more democratic stages lose something in art, but advance in material wealth, in domestic comfort and in the political education of a larger number of persons. Minoan-Mycenaean society may well have been able to exercise a higher and wider influence, in its later ages than in its earlier, on the Caro-Lelegians, and, through them, on the earliest Greek settlers in Asia.

About the other influences exercised, from the opposite eastern quarter, upon the pre-Hellenic civilization of the west Anatolian littoral, Greek tradition has, naturally, much less to say, and our opinion must be based more upon archaeological data. The tradition does, indeed, record memories of frequent early relations between Carians and 'Phoenicians,' whether these were 'Cadmeians,' or men from the Syrian coast. There was an early social union of the two races in Rhodes; and Athenaeus cites Corinna and Bacchylides as authorities for a 'Phoenician' Caria. Thales, the Milesian, was said by some to have had Phoenician forbears: and there are names, personal and local, common to the Carian and the Phoenician areas. The prosecution of active trade along the Anatolian coast by these carriers of 'Assyrian cargoes' (as Herodotus says of the Phoenicians) is reflected clearly enough in the *Iliad* and in the early traditions of Hellespontine towns, such as Abydos and Lampsacus. It is illustrated also, for a somewhat later age, by the objects of Phoenico-Egyptian fabric and style found in great abundance in the soil of Rhodes. The cultural value of Phoenician relations may be estimated variously; but that their influence on artistic fabrics and motives in western Anatolia was considerable must be allowed to the champions of a Semitic share in the evolution of Hellenic art. Certainly, by whomsoever introduced, oriental decorative motives offer in the Carian region, by the pottery, metal and faïence fabrics of Rhodes and Miletus, the most conspicuous, and probably the earliest, evidence of their influence upon Hellenic manufacture.

Some cultural solidarity between Asiatic Carians and the other

Asiatic societies, which lay behind them in Lydia, Lycia and Phrygia, might safely be presumed, even if there were no such Greek testimony to it as is given by the well-known statement about the participation of Lydians and Mysians in the Carian cult of Mylasa, or, even if we had not the philological evidence of homonymies. It is worthy of remark that what the Greeks regarded as typical Carian armament is represented on monuments of several inland peoples, in Phrygia, in Cappadocia, and even in north Syria. More will be said generally upon these inland civilizations of western Asia Minor in a subsequent volume. While the earlier Asiatic culture of Lycia is still sealed from us, that of Lydia is being tapped by the American excavation of Sardes; and monumental evidence about the Phrygian has long been known. This last, and with it (or through its mediation) Cappadocian culture, undoubtedly exercised, like the Lydian, the most direct and potent effect on the Ionian section of the littoral, where Pherecydes expressly tells us the Lelegians were in possession before any Hellenes, and already had built Ephesus. As for the Aeolic section, we have not only evidence in the *Iliad* of its intimate connection with Phrygia, but strong archaeological proof, in the earlier strata of Hissarlik, of some cultural solidarity between the Troad and Hattic Cappadocia.

#### IV. THE PROCESS OF SETTLEMENT

Greek tradition regarded the process of Hellenic settlement in Asia as having been not only spread over a long period of time, but effected in very various ways. On the whole, except for the epic Achaean struggle for footing in the Troad, and a story told by Herodotus concerning the advent of the Ionians to Miletus, it believed that gradual infiltration rather than sudden violence was the rule, especially in the settlement of Ionia. At Erythrae, a small body of Hellenes introduced itself into a 'barbarian' community, which tolerated them for their knowledge of trade and superior arts of life, until the new-comers found themselves able to take the lead. At Chios, the islanders, who long stood out of the Ionian League, came in voluntarily in the end. Intermarriage of Greek men and Asiatic women was to be expected on the general analogy of early colonization, and because Greeks were not much concerned to preserve their purity of race. We hear of it as a general practice of the Ionian settlers; and there is a well-known instance of a Greek princess of Cyme marrying a Phrygian. If Miletus was, in any way, exceptional in this regard

(Herodotus' manner of telling the story of the rape of the Carian women may be thought to suggest something unusual), the resultant impurity of its civic blood (though the Milesians themselves boasted pure Ionism) may help to account for certain features of its character and history, for instance, for the superior vigour and enterprise of its citizens, conspicuously displayed in its prodigal foundation of secondary colonies and factories.

The primary Greek settlements very early threw out secondary ones into their immediate neighbourhoods. So Miletus founded Iasos, and Cyne and Lesbos peopled all their neighbouring coasts and islets. All the western or Aegean littoral and the Propontic coast, with one ultimate outpost on the Black Sea, Heracleia Pontica, came to be occupied before the historic age began. The rest of the Euxine shores had to wait for the secondary expansion of Miletus. On the south coast of Asia Minor we do not meet with primary Hellenic colonization east of Rhodes, till the Cilician-Cypriote group of cities, already spoken of, is reached; but there appear to have been settlements of Greeks, which were rather of the nature of factories, in Pamphylian towns, such as P̄aselis (reckoned, strictly speaking, Lycian), Perga and Aspendus, whose populations, like their names, remained predominantly native; and also in Cilician towns such as Tarsus. Of colonies planted in the interior at a greater distance than usually divided Greek cities and their proper port-towns (Colophon and Notium stood in this mutual relation, the citizens of the two being equally Colophonians, dwelling respectively at the 'old city' and 'the sea-side') we hear only in the Maeander and Hermus valleys. Magnesia ad Maeandrum and Tralles claimed origins as early as any coastal settlements; so did also the other Magnesia, under Sipylus.

The next Greek attempts at secondary colonization were directed to the southern coast. Cyne is said to have been the first Asiatic Greek city to become the mother of a 'foreign' colony, when she planted a group of settlers at Side in Pamphylia; but they soon lapsed to barbarism. Rhodes established two small factories on the central Lycian coast, and joined with some Dorians, whose origin is unknown, to colonize Soli in Cilicia. Samos occupied Nagidos and Celenderis in western Cilicia. Little, if anything, more seems to have been attempted in these regions; and perhaps some indication of a sufficient deterrent cause is conveyed by a record of Sargon of Assyria (late eighth century), who boasts that his fleets had chased and caught ships of Javan 'like fish' in the Cyprian seas, and given peace to Cilicia and

Tyre. In any case, the Greeks were bound to meet formidable competitors as soon as they tried to enter the easternmost Levant. Since Lycia is mostly Alpine mountains, which bar trade with the interior, while Pamphylia is largely marsh-land and hardly less closed behind, and western Cilicia is a very rugged land, eastern or plain Cilicia can have been the only considerable district of the southern littoral to be desired; and here, as has been already argued, too old and well organized a society, inclusive of some long-established Greeks, existed to leave much room or opportunity for foreign colonization.

The Syrian and Egyptian coasts were virtually closed to colonists from overseas; but we do find a Greek (Yāwāni) ruling Ashdod in 720 B.C., and a Milesian factory was already established somewhere on the lowest reaches of the Canopic Nile before the foundation of that general Greek settlement at Naucratis, which falls early in the sixth century (possibly earlier if Milesians were, indeed, there before other Greeks). Except for this sustained effort to capture Egyptian trade, the greatest Asiatic mother of colonies, Miletus, seems to have turned her attention wholly northwards—to the coasts of the Straits, the Propontis and the Black Sea. There, in the wake of the 'Argo,' she expected no serious competitor, and, unlike the eastern Levant, all shores were open. Though it is too much to say that she simply carried on earlier Carian enterprise in the Euxine, the direction of her efforts was probably influenced both by Carian tradition and by the local knowledge of Pontic coasts possessed by the Carian element in her population. The 'thalassocracy,' lasting eighteen years, with which Eusebius credits Miletus, must be taken to mark the inception of the amazing expansive effort which (according to a probably exaggerated tradition) eventually left the northern shores of Asia Minor settled at more than seventy points by Milesian colonists. The date given by Eusebius for this thalassocracy falls in the latter half of the eighth century, and there seems no sufficient reason for transferring it to any later moment.

The secondary expansion of Miletus, begun soon after the middle of the eighth century, was sustained far into the seventh. We are told that, as late as the time of Gyges of Lydia, she absorbed the old Aeolian town of Abydos on the Hellespont; and still later, she colonized Odessus, Apollonia Pontica and a few more. Since among the earliest of her settlements were some on the Crimean coast, for example, Panticapaeum, it looks as if the Milesians, in their first northward ventures, had shunned the

shores of the Straits and the Marmora, where Greek settlers were established already, and had made rather for coasts where Greek claims had not yet been pegged out. When after a generation or two her daughter-towns came to dominate the Euxine, control its trade, and possess ships enough of their own to overawe opposition, Miletus ventured to seize ancient holdings of Greeks. A decree of Apollonia on the Rhyndacus, found at Miletus, makes it clear that fighting took place here and there on the occasion of such seizures. Certain of the daughter-towns became mothers in their turn. Details become more abundant at the late date of such foundations, and we are allowed to see that not all owed their origin to patriotic volunteers setting forth to increase the trade of their native cities. Some (Sinope offers an instance, and it may be that the latest Milesian colonies of the Tyrant era supply others) were the result of the expulsion, or voluntary exile, of groups of disaffected or defeated partisans.

The motive which impelled them had doubtless operated often enough during the great days of colonization in the oligarchical period. Where land and privilege were in very few hands, but at the same time all of Greek blood were aristocrats in comparison with the native populations among which they lived, the attraction of self-exile to a new scene of political life, and a novel opportunity of power must have been very great. Nor is it difficult to understand why both oligarchs and tyrants encouraged such migrations, seeing that, at one stroke they rid the home state of discontented elements and enlarged the range of its commercial primacy. For it was a rule of Greek secondary expansion that a colony modelled itself on its mother, maintained continuous relations with her, and preserved jealously the memory of its origin. The general identity of cults in colonies and mother-cities illustrates this attitude. A pact with four colonies has come to light at Miletus, who justly prided herself on being a creator of cities, and in an inscription of a later age boasts herself not only the eldest of Ionian settlements, but also the mother of many and great cities in Pontus and Egypt and many other parts of the habitable world.

Though none was nearly so prolific as she, other Asiatic cities sent out secondary colonies far and wide—Samos, for example, not only to Asia but to Macedonia and Sicily; Teos, to the Cimmerian Bosphorus; Colophon, to southern Italy; Clazomenae, to both sides of the Hellespont; Chios, to Thrace; Phocaea, to the Hellespont and Euxine, as well as western seas. Of Cyme and Rhodes in this respect something has been said already. The enterprise of almost all the primary Asiatic settlements met in

the maintenance of Naucratis, Miletus claiming primacy and special privilege, but the other Ionian cities having their places in the Egyptian sun. Whence it results, by an irony of fate, that we have recovered more evidence of Ionian art from a settlement in Egypt than from all Ionia itself. Indeed, till the early strata on the Artemisium site of Ephesus were explored in 1904-5, our best witness to the products of early Ionia had to be summoned from places so remote on the one hand as Naucratis and Daphnae in the delta of the Nile, and, on the other, as Vettersfelde in Lusatia.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abh.	Abhandlungen.
Abh. K.M.	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
A.J.A.	American Journal of Archaeology.
A.J. Ph.	American Journal of Philology.
A.J.S.L.	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
Anc. Eg.	Ancient Egypt.
A.S.A.E.	Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte.
Ath. Mitt.	Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Athenische Abteilung.
B. z. Ass.	Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.
B.C.H.	Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique.
B.I.C.	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale au Caire.
Bay. S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. bayerischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften.
Berl. S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
Biblica	Biblica. Commentarii editi a Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma.
B.S.A.	Annual of the British School at Athens.
B.S.R.	Papers of the British School at Rome.
Bull. d. I.	Bullettino dell' Istituto.
C.A.H.	Cambridge Ancient History.
C.I.G.	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
C.I.L.	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
C.I.S.	Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.
C.J.	Classical Journal.
C.Q.	Classical Quarterly.
C.R.	Classical Review.
C.R. Ac. Inscr.	Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions.
D.B.	Dictionary of the Bible (J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1898).
E. Bi.	Encyclopaedia Biblica.
E. Brit.	Encyclopaedia Britannica. Ed. XI.
E.H.R.	English Historical Review.
E.R.E.	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.
Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.	Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική.
F.H.G.	C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.
G.G.A.	Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.
Geogr. Z.	Geographische Zeitschrift.
Head H.N.	Head, Historia Numorum, 2nd Ed. 1912.
Herm.	Hermes.
I.G.F.	Indogermanische Forschungen.
J.A.O.S.	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
J.A.	Journal Asiatique.
J.B.S.	Journal of Biblical Studies.
J.D.A.I.	Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts.
J.E.A.	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.
J.H.S.	Journal of Hellenic Studies.
J. Man. E.O.S.	Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society.
J.R.A.I.	Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.R.S.	Journal of Roman Studies.



J.S.O.R.	Journal of the Society of Oriental Research.
K.A.H.	Keilinschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts.
Klio.	Klio (Beiträge zur alten Geschichte).
Liv. A.A.	Liverpool Annals of Archaeology.
M.B.B.A.	Monatsbericht der Berliner Akademie.
M.D.O.G.	Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.
M.D.P.V.	Mitteilungen des deutschen Palästinavereins.
M.V.A.G.	Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.
Mon. d. I.	Monumenti Antichi dell' Istituto.
N.J. Kl. Alt.	Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum.
N.J.P.	Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie.
N.S.A.	Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità (Atti d. r. Accad. dei Lincei).
Num. Chr.	Numismatic Chronicle.
Num. Z.	Numismatische Zeitschrift.
O.L.Z.	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
P.E.F.	Palestine Exploration Fund.
Phil.	Philologus.
P.S.B.A.	Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
P.W.	Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.
Πρ.	Πρακτικά.
Q.S.	Quarterly Statement(s).
Rec. Trav.	Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne.
Rev. A.	Revue archéologique.
Rev. Ass.	Revue d'Assyriologie.
Rev. Bib.	Revue biblique internationale.
Rev. Eg.	Revue égyptologique.
Rev. E.G.	Revue des études grecques.
Rev. H.	Revue historique.
Rev. N.	Revue numismatique.
Rh. Mus.	Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.
Riv. Fil.	Rivista di Filologia.
Riv. N.O.	Rivista nuova orientale.
Röm. Mitth.	Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Römische Abteilung.
R.V.	Revised Version.
R.V. mg.	Revised Version margin.
S.B.	Sitzungsberichte.
Syria.	Syria: Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie.
T.S.B.A.	Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
Wien S.B.	Sitzungsberichte d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Wien.
Wien St.	Wiener Studien.
W.Z.K.M.	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
Z.A.	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
Z. Aeg.	Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.
Z.A.T.W.	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
Z.D.M.G.	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
Z.D.P.V.	Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Z.E.	Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.
Z.G. f. E.	Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde.
Z.N.	Zeitschrift für Numismatik.

## CHAPTER XX

## HELLENIC SETTLEMENT IN ASIA MINOR

- Beloch, J. Griechische Geschichte, 1 (esp. chap. v). Strassburg, 1913- .
- Bilabel, F. Die Ionische Kolonisation. J. Phil., Suppl. Bd. xiv, 1, 1920.
- Boehlau. Aus ionischen u. italischen Nekropolen. Leipzig, 1898.
- Dörpfeld, W. Troja und Ilion. Athens, 1902.
- Hogarth, D. G. Ionia and the East. Oxford, 1909.
- Holm, A. Geschichte Griechenlands, 1. Berlin, 1886. Eng. tr. 1894.
- Körte, G. and A. Ath. Mitt. xxiv, 1; Arch. Anz. 1901, 1; Gordion, Berlin, 1904.
- Meyer, E. Forschungen zur alten Geschichte. 1. Die Herkunft der Ionier und die Ionsage. Halle, 1892.
- Geschichte des Altertums, 1, 2. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1922.
- Myres, J. L. Early Pot-fabrics of Asia Minor. J.R.A.I. 1903.
- J.H.S. xvi, pp. 243 *sqq.* (on Caria).
- Ramsay, Sir W. M. Contributions to the History of Southern Aeolis (J.H.S. 11); Sipylos and Cybele (*ib.* 111); Newly Discovered Sites near Smyrna (*ib.* 1).
- Ridgeway, Sir W. Early Age of Greece, 1. Cambridge, 1901.
- Schmidt, H. Schliemann's Sammlung trojanischer Altertümer. Berlin, 1902.
- Wiegand, Th. Siebenter vorläufige Bericht über die...in Milet...Ausgrabungen. Berlin, 1911.
- Winter, Fr. Ath. Mitt. xii, p. 226 (on Ionia).
- See also the articles on various Greek cities of Asia in P.W.